

OFFICIAL



College of  
Policing

**Title:** Board meeting  
**Date:** 06 November 2019  
**Time:** 11:10 – 15:30  
**Venue:** Broadway House, Tothill St, London, SW1H 9NQ – Abbey Room

<b>Board</b>	
Millie Banerjee (MB)	Board Chair
Christine Elliott (CE)	Chair Nominations and Remuneration Committee and College Regulatory Consultation Group (CRCG) & Senior Independent Director
Mike Cunningham (MC)	CEO & Chair Professional Committee
David Bamber (DB)	Police Federation of England and Wales
Clare Minchington (CM) (Dial in)	Chair Audit & Risk Committee & Independent Director
Robin Wilkinson	Chair Members' Committee & Police Staff Association
Ian Hopkins	National Police Chiefs' Council (NPCC)
Stephen Mold (SM)	Association of Police & Crime Commissioners (APCC)
Jackie Smith (JS)	Independent Director
Ian Wylie (IW)	Independent Director

<b>Executive in attendance</b>	
Rachel Tuffin (RT)	Director of Knowledge and Innovation
Bernie O'Reilly	Director of Organisational Change
Kate Husselbee (KH)	Director of Corporate Services and Business Development
Jo Noakes (JN)	Director of Workforce Development, Professional Development & Integrity Faculty

<b>Staff members in attendance</b>	
Oliver Cattermole (OC)	Chief of Staff & Change Programme Director
Sharon Harrison (SH)	Staff Officer to CEO
Fiona Eldridge (FE) (Item 6)	Head of Diversity, Inclusion and Engagement
Lucy Stewart-Winters (LSW) (Item 9)	Head of Ethics & Equality, Diversity and Inclusion
Helen Elderfield (HE)	Head of Corporate Governance
Camille Giffard (CG)	Governance Manager

## **PART ONE – PRELIMINARY ITEMS**

### **1. Welcome and administration (Chair)**

- 1.1. The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting. She noted that the meeting had been duly convened and a quorum was present.
- 1.2. Apologies for absence were received from Paul Griffiths and Janette McCormick.
- 1.3. There were no declarations of interest made pertaining to items on the agenda.
- 1.4. No items were raised for discussion under Any Other Business.

### **2. Minutes of the meeting on 18 September 2019 (Chair)**

- 2.1. The draft minutes were considered and accepted as a true and accurate record of the discussions that took place on 18 September 2019 without amendment.

#### Decision

The Board resolved to:

- (i) **Approve** the minutes of the meeting held on 18 September 2019.

### **3. Matters arising from the meeting on 18 September 2019 (Chair)**

- 3.1. It was noted that two actions were ongoing and the Board agreed that the actions listed as suggested complete could be closed.

#### Action

Actions marked as suggested complete to be closed. **Camille Giffard**

#### Decision

The Board resolved to:

- (i) **Note** progress made with the actions agreed at the previous meetings
- (ii) **Agree** to close all actions recorded on the rolling actions list as suggested complete.

## **PART TWO – ITEMS FOR DECISION / DISCUSSION**

### **CORE DELIVERY ITEMS**

Fiona Eldridge joined the meeting.

### **4. Operation Uplift programme update (BR)**

- 4.1. Bernie O'Reilly summarised the main points of the paper on behalf of Janette McCormick and advised that Jo Noakes was doing much of the collaboration work. The Operation Uplift National Programme had been fully established and the College had set up an internal programme to support it in a consistent and controlled way.
- 4.2. Bernie advised that Jo sat on the National Programme Board as a voting member which reported in to the National Policing Board that Mike Cunningham sat on. Janette was seconded from the College as National Programme Director chairing the Delivery Group.

## OFFICIAL

- 4.3. Eight key programme workstreams had been established, each with a named College representative: diversity, attraction, recruitment, pre-employment, enablers, retention, learning and development, and organisational design and workforce planning. A joint communications strategy was in development. The national recruitment campaign had been launched and an Assessment Centre capacity review was being conducted, including an appraisal of the College's capability and capacity.
- 4.4. The College internal programme governance arrangements were in place with a bi-weekly leadership meeting Chaired by Bernie, a weekly delivery group meeting with membership from all key workstreams and business functions chaired by the programme manager Angus Bustin, a monthly assurance meeting chaired by Jo Noakes, and regular reporting to the College Board. The intention was for the programme to be fully functioning across the College by 31 December 2019 with a complete plan and agreed timescales, clear lines of accountability and communication, reporting, identified, qualified, managed and mitigated risks and issues, formal agreement of programme approach, and the establishment of a programme team made up of colleagues from across the College with clearly identified and agreed roles and responsibilities.
- 4.5. From a financial perspective, the College had committed to spend on the basis that funding would be confirmed without delay and in order to avoid the College being seen as holding up the process. The initial tranche of £2.2m in-year funding had been confirmed on 5 November. Further funding would be sought to support Day One, in particular the digital platform and assessor recruitment.
- 4.6. The Chair advised that she had attended the PCC conference at Ryton at which Operation Uplift had been presented by Mike, Jo and Janette and that she had felt very proud of the work and analysis the College had done. Stephen Mold thanked the College for hosting the conference and observed that there had been a significant improvement in the relationship. A comment was made that this highlighted the importance of the College's convening role.
- 4.7. The principal focus of Board discussions was on diversity and the challenges in this area for the national campaign. There was still work to do to attract applicants of minority ethnic background for a range of reasons.
- 4.8. It was recognised that the discussion about positive action/discrimination would continue, especially in light of the Furlong case, *M Furlong v Chief Constable of Cheshire Police* (2019), which examined the distinction between positive action and positive discrimination. This had been previously discussed but would need to be revisited. Day One assessment centres would be considered alongside local attraction and positive action in terms of their potential to deliver diversity.
- 4.9. Mike assured the Board that the College would continue to look at what worked in relation to diversity, to pick up on successes in the different forces and what activities could be rolled out more widely. It would remain a challenge for the lifetime of the programme.
- 4.10. Jo indicated that diversity was a constant narrative embedded at the heart of the programme, looking at what could be done better in each selection process. Fiona Eldridge's paper on diversity referred to it as the lens through which everything was examined.
- 4.11. More generally in respect of Operation Uplift, Jo advised that a strategy event was being held at Ryton to bring together the different NPCC leads for each workstream.

## OFFICIAL

- 4.12. Mike and Jo emphasised that the College would be really clear in the Programme Board that its responsibilities sat primarily with attraction and recruitment, the assessment process and the Code of Ethics and that this was where efforts were being focused.
- 4.13. With vetting being done by individual forces, it was asked whether a national vetting process might be developed. There was a national policy around vetting but risks were carried locally so there was variation in risk appetite. It was likely that Operation Uplift would clarify what needed to be done at the national level and what should be retained locally, because of the scale of the initiative.
- 4.14. Jo gave some additional information relating to SEARCH, that the College was delivering, and Day One, that the Metropolitan Police Service had developed. The national rollout of Day One had been brought forward due to Operation Uplift but improvements in IT were required before roll out. The intention was to implement Day One in College sites from 2020 and other sites by February 2021. Guidance had been issued to forces that a Day One pass would be equivalent to a SEARCH pass. Bernie commented that it would be important to build confidence around Day One rather than mandating it. The priority would be to secure the Year One funding once the General Election had taken place.
- 4.15. Board members enquired specifically about developments in relation to retention which Mike observed was almost as important as recruitment. Arrangements were being stepped up and the national programme was being encouraged to take a wide view of retention.
- 4.16. The Chair asked for a paper to come back to the next Board meeting addressing some of the issues raised, especially around activities owned by the College and its key partners, and providing an update.
- 4.17. The Chair also asked for the PCC conference slides on Operation Uplift to be circulated to Board members.

### Action

Paper to be brought to the 29 January Board meeting providing an update and addressing some of the issues raised, especially around activities owned by the College or its key partners. **Bernie O'Reilly**

Operation Uplift slides from the PCC conference to be circulated to Board members. **Nathan Oley**

### Decision

The Board resolved to:

- (i) **Note** the progress being made
- (ii) **Note** that, as requested, further monthly board reports will provide evidence of a robust College programme framework that demonstrates a joined up approach to meet and deliver against the National requirement
- (iii) **Note** the financial position and the associated risks for this financial year.

## **5. Fast Track and Direct Entry (FTDE) Evaluation reports to Parliament (JN)**

- 5.1. Jo Noakes advised that the timelines had changed from those in the paper due to the General Election announcement. It had been intended to submit the evaluations on 19 November but it was now likely that they would be laid in January.

## OFFICIAL

- 5.2. The evaluations showed that direct entry leaders could work in policing, providing some success in relation to diversity and offering different perspectives. Good learning had been gained for any future programmes in relation to marketing and support from forces. There were three main areas of focus:
- 5.2.1. Demand: Was there still a demand for all the programmes? DE Superintendent was being paused for 2020 due to lack of demand but Fast Track and DE Inspector were in demand. There was a question around frequency and whether the programmes should be run annually, be demand-led or have different timescales. There was a lot of interest in an Inspector to Superintendent FT programme to focus on developing internal talent.
  - 5.2.2. Diversity: Could the programmes increase diversity? This differed between FT and DE cohorts. All showed slightly better diversity, though the numbers were too low to be statistically significant. The College would continue to look at recruitment processes and attraction to understand how better diversity outcomes might be achieved.
  - 5.2.3. Finance: Was it financially viable? The costs over 5 years had been £16m including salaries and marketing. Future costs would depend on whether the Home Office continued to fund the programme. Options were set out in the paper but there were no obvious savings without significant risk. The DE programmes were unlikely to continue if funding was withdrawn.
- 5.3. It was suggested that it would be useful to understand more about individual motivation for participating in the programme, to see if this could identify levers for improving diversity.
- 5.4. It was also observed that the financial information in the Fast Track report was compromised because there was no comparison with alternative routes. Comparative costings should be included in future papers considering the future of the programmes.
- 5.5. It was asked whether the programmes could be viewed as a success, with mixed views being expressed.
- 5.6. Positive observations were that: candidates had brought different thinking and had to be resilient to succeed in spite of the challenges; it had been good for gender diversity at Superintendent and Inspector level; there was appetite for the FT programme from leadership of the service, and FT also showed stronger results in relation to diversity.
- 5.7. More circumspect comments included that: there was no sense of appetite for the Superintendent programme, diversity comparisons looked positive in terms of existing representation figures but attraction remained a problem, and the DE programmes would need to deliver more visible difference, especially in urban forces.
- 5.8. Rachel Tuffin indicated that she would discuss the choice of diversity comparators with Jo. She commented that the legislative changes regarding re-joiners would not have been achieved without the DE programmes as they represented a shift in understanding of what was possible in policing.
- 5.9. Success would depend on how it was categorised and the commentary around the report when laid in Parliament would be key if it was to influence next steps. The numbers were small and all elements of police recruitment would need to be scrutinised further to understand how they could be increased. Care would also be needed when closing elements of the programme to ensure joiners to the service via the scheme were supported to avoid any detrimental effects. It was

## OFFICIAL

clarified that the College owned the processes and whether to continue or close was a College decision, but it would be futile to keep the groups going in the absence of demand from the service.

- 5.10. The Chair commented that it was important to look at other sectors for lessons, consider what kind of diversity was being targeted, be realistic about timescales for achieving outcomes as they could take a long time, and be mindful of dynamic of scale as costs decrease as numbers grow. She observed that many industries had found that internal and external fast track programmes had to run together with a combined cohort. She summarised that there was a need to think about communications, especially what inferences could be drawn from the data, and that whether the programmes continued depended on demand and support from the new administration, so would need to be reconsidered after the General Election. She asked for this to come back to the Board at that point for it to take a view.

### Action

An update to be provided to the Board following the general election, to include a new laying date for the evaluation reports and a timeframe for consultation on the future of the programmes. **Jo Noakes**

Comparative costings should be included in future papers considering the future of the programmes. **Jo Noakes**

### Decision

The Board resolved to:

- (i) **Discuss** the proposed areas for consideration
- (ii) **Endorse** the intention to consult with stakeholders on the future of the FTDE programme beyond 2020
- (iii) **Endorse** the College Executive's intention to submit the reports to Parliament

## **6. Inclusion and Diversity - College Ambition and Actions (FE)**

- 6.1. Fiona Eldridge introduced the position statement and set out the activity planned in five key areas to the end of the 2019/20, with the focus likely to continue beyond this period. The key areas were guidance, peer review, positive action, inclusion and accelerating promotion. Embedding diversity and inclusion would require culture change and careful handling, and the College had a significant role to play in sharing good practice and clarifying guidance. Fiona invited feedback on the position statement and plans.
- 6.2. Board members found the paper confused about the respective roles of the College and NPCC in leading on diversity and inclusion. Alignment of the College and NPCC positions would be key.
- 6.3. The NPCC had previously developed a comprehensive strategy which it was decided the NPCC would lead with the support of the College. The paper seemed to be suggesting the College step back into a leadership role for diversity across policing. It was agreed that there was a distinction to be made between leading on diversity and adopting a leadership role in relation to some aspects of it.
- 6.4. It was also agreed that the separation between the internal position and College's own profile, and the College's external role as influencer, enabler and leader was unclear. The position statement should address this point.

## OFFICIAL

- 6.5. Mike indicated that the College accepted the challenge to look at everything it owned, push itself to increase ambition, and better develop its influencing role. He agreed that the College and Chiefs needed to find their respective places on the agenda. He took the view that the College did have a leadership function in standard setting, pushing boundaries and holding a mirror up to the service. There were issues where the College needed to challenge the service to be more ambitious. Further work was required to articulate and delineate this better. The statement could be jointly presented to Chiefs with Ian Hopkins as national lead. Ian agreed and observed that it would be important for Chiefs to remain engaged with the agenda.
- 6.6. It was asked whether the College's approach worked in its own recruitment and noted that the College could not take on a leadership role if internal problems were not tackled. It was suggested that the College focus on doing what it could do really well rather than taking on too much, so that it could show leadership and ability to deliver.
- 6.7. Fiona thanked the Board for the very useful feedback and commented that the initial lack of separation had been deliberate to enable internal and external to mirror each other.
- 6.8. The Chair remarked that it was overall an excellent paper but the Board would like the position statement further developed to make the separation clearer, so the College could look at itself and what it did but also its role in the wider policing family. She requested that the position statement be brought back to the Board for further consideration and approval once revised, at one of the next two Board meetings.
- 6.9. It was discussed whether PCCs could be encouraged to include diversity in their crime plans. It was clarified that it was a matter for them but that it would be encouraged.

### Action

Position statement to be brought back to the Board for further consideration and approval at the March 2020 Board meeting. **Fiona Eldridge**

### Decision

The Board resolved to:

- (i) **Decline** approval of the position statement until it had been further developed to show a clearer separation
- (ii) **Support** the plans for the forthcoming year

## **7. PEQF Initial Entry Routes Implementation Update (JN)**

- 7.1. The purpose of this paper was to provide an implementation update and signal that a report would be coming to the Board in January.
- 7.2. Police Constable Degree Apprenticeship (PCDA): This was already live in 14 forces and would include a further 13 by June 2020.
- 7.3. Degree Holder Entry Programme (DHEP): Four forces were live with this and a further 19 were expected by June 2020. Police Now was recognised as a role specific pathway within DHEP.
- 7.4. 25 universities were already offering the Pre-Join Degree, with a further 11 undergoing the College's confirmation process and expected in 2020 subject to being confirmed.

## OFFICIAL

- 7.5. Further College work included working with NPCC to align the detective specific entry routes with PEQF and working with the Special Constabulary to develop an agreed educational provision. This was likely to be an accredited subset of the regular programme.
- 7.6. The College was working with forces in relation to the impact of Operation Uplift on their implementation plans. Some forces wanted to bring it forward, others wanted to extend IPLDP further. An increase in implementation support was being discussed and more abstraction modelling was being conducted. Regional events were being arranged to share information and good practice.
- 7.7. The One Year On report would be the most significant report on the new entry routes since the original consultation report. The College had also committed to a full evaluation of the Police Constable Degree Apprenticeship throughout the first full three years of the programme, across 7 'early adopter' forces. Initial findings from this longer term evaluation would be included in One Year On report, primarily in the sections on diversity, lessons learned and good practice.
- 7.8. Mike advised that the College wanted to be flexible to support forces with Operation Uplift. Two Board members indicated that their forces had applied for extensions for reasons of procurement and volume, with one asking to work with the College around evaluation, particularly abstraction. A suggestion was made to avoid using the term 'abstraction' where possible, because its negative connotations would distract from the positive aspects of investing in learning and development.
- 7.9. The Lincolnshire application for leave to apply for judicial review had been refused but Lincolnshire had subsequently requested an oral hearing. Negotiations were ongoing but were unlikely to achieve a resolution prior to the oral hearing. Board members asked to see the judgment.
- 7.10. In response to a query as to whether any lessons learned from Direct Entry could apply to PEQF, it was explained that there were still cultural issues with accepting individuals entering the service through academic and non-traditional routes.
- 7.11. It was noted that removal of the apprenticeship levy, if it occurred, would cause significant challenges.
- 7.12. Rachel confirmed that independent social researchers were already involved in providing independent validation for the One Year On report.

### Action

Judicial Review judgment refusing leave to apply for judicial review to be circulated. **Sharon Harrison**

### Decision

The Board resolved to:

- (i) **Note** progress towards implementation of the new programmes
- (ii) **Note** the potential impact of Operation Uplift on the new entry routes
- (iii) **Note** that the full PEQF Initial Entry Routes One Year On Report would be presented to the Board in January 2020

Fiona Eldridge left the meeting.



## ENABLING ITEMS

### 8. Transforming our College update (BR)

- 8.1. Mike prefaced the discussion by saying that he was happy with the output from KPMG but the move from the high level descriptor would be challenging. It was important to obtain Board input on next steps and to set clear expectations.
- 8.2. Bernie O'Reilly recapped the case for change and the progress so far, concluding with the KPMG findings. They had found much pride in public service within the College, but also no clear prioritisation process and no oversight of demand, skills and capabilities. They had produced a preferred high-level capability-led model accompanied by an outline plan of 11 critical first steps.
- 8.3. Bernie indicated that in particular the organisation would need to better understand demand for its services and capabilities of its personnel. His preference would be to engage a delivery partner with the skills to deliver the model, and to bring in additional people to support the achievement of the 11 priority actions.
- 8.4. A stage 1 gateway review (business justification) of the outline business case had been completed and would be considered at the December Audit & Risk Committee.
- 8.5. The main questions for the Board were whether the College should pursue the preferred option delivery partner or manage the next steps of the change programme in-house and what level of assurance it would like.
- 8.6. Mike indicated that Board members had a great deal of experience of leading change which needed to be drawn on. His own experience as a Chief Constable was that a delivery partner was key.
- 8.7. Board members were generally complimentary of the paper, the work achieved so far and the direction of travel.
- 8.8. What was now needed was a plan to understand the exact implications of the high-level model and how to get things done. It would turn the College into more of a delivery organisation which made credibility a priority. Design principles were needed for the operating model – these had been drafted but required finalisation.
- 8.9. The key propositions were how to improve prioritisation in the College and how to get it to deliver. It was suggested that the College should engage in fewer activities but deliver really well, which required more thinking about priorities and how that would be clearly conveyed to the service. Mike commented that this would require work with stakeholders and staff with primary responsibility, a programme of work and business discipline.
- 8.10. Board members agreed that commitment to the change programme would require proper investment. A delivery partner would bring in capacity and capability when needed rather than having it on the books all the time. They would need to be incentivised with milestones and structured payments but would bring pace and discipline. If this was not affordable, assurances should be sought from the Home Office. Contractors would need full time management and could choose to leave. Board members wanted a better understanding of what funding was available in the budget and if there was a way to phase spending. A suggestion was made to seek funding from the PRTB underspend as the transformation could be seen as for the benefit of policing. It was also suggested that some external partners may be willing to do some work ahead of tender.

## OFFICIAL

Mike indicated that the capability model would need to have two types of resourcing: annual allocation but also a more dynamic flexible process that moved people around as needed, which the current structure did not allow for.

- 8.11. Board members also discussed the people side of the programme. There were many committed and passionate people in the College but there would be some tough personal decisions for the Executive to make if real cultural change was to be achieved. Not all would see the change as an opportunity. KPMG had highlighted some concerns that they had observed regarding the approach to change and resistance to working differently.
- 8.12. Board members emphasised that internal communications continued to be a key factor in maintaining workforce support for the programme. It would be important to be clear and upfront that this was not a one-off process but the beginning of the next phase of the organisation.
- 8.13. A concern was expressed around the specific difficulty of change programmes in policing because of the need to maintain business as usual. It had to be accepted that systems would be running in parallel for the duration of the programme. It would take a minimum of 18 months – 2 years to embed what was quite radical change and it could not be simply business as usual.
- 8.14. The Chair summarised the discussions as indicating that there was support for the recommendations in the paper, with the general view being that the change should be properly funded but that more detail on the practicalities was required. A further paper was to be brought to the Board detailing the next steps, acquiring funding and selecting a delivery partner. Suggestions from other Board members were to identify the work that the College could stop doing in order to release resources and to complete a robust business case showing realistically affordable options.

### Action

Additional detail to be prepared for the Board to include next steps, funding options, selecting a delivery partner, the work that might be stopped and a business case showing realistically affordable options. **Bernie O'Reilly**

### Decision

The Board resolved to:

- (i) **Note** the progress detailed in this paper
- (ii) **Discuss** the options presented at 9.3
- (iii) **Confirm** the assurances the Board require for future meetings

## **9. Ethics Committee (MC)**

Lucy Stewart-Winters joined the meeting.

- 9.1. Mike Cunningham introduced the proposal to establish an independent ethics committee for the College, building on the experience of some police forces. The Chair observed that a committee could offer increased transparency.
- 9.2. Lucy Stewart-Winters explained that the proposal was for a committee to advise the Executive on current and planned activities to build trust and confidence. There would be an expectation that projects and programmes would seek the committee's advice. She had looked at other committees including the GMP committee and the composition of the London panel, which showed the College did not have the in-house expertise.

## OFFICIAL

- 9.3. Mike clarified that it would look at issues that the College dealt with, such as facial recognition, stop and search and undercover, guidance for which may benefit from the scrutiny of an independent committee. It would not sit as a committee of the Board but it would be reasonable for the Board to take an interest in whether something had been through the Ethics Committee. It was recognised that there was a financial element which needed to be borne in mind in light of the earlier discussion on the change programme.
- 9.4. The Chair commented that key features of the proposed committee would be for it to: be properly independent; have the right composition; have a clear process; and not be a committee of the Board.
- 9.5. Board members were supportive. They agreed that such committees could work well with the right composition, tasking and support. They also thought it would be incongruous for the College not to have one.
- 9.6. Board members suggested it could be developed as part of transformation, potentially becoming a tool for the prioritisation process and part of the solution in transforming the College. It would provide a transparent ethical lens. It could also be a visible place to recruit diversely and have a role to play in relation to international work, being independent of government.
- 9.7. Board members wanted to know more about how the committee would function, in particular:
- What the ground rules would be
  - How it would incorporate diversity
  - How it would be funded
  - How it would be terminated if it was not working
  - Where it would report, for example could it report yearly to Board on themes and issues?
  - How it would fit with Professional Committee
  - How it would be tasked in and out
  - Whether it would be an ethics committee for the College or a national ethics committee supported by the College?
  - Whether it would be part of standard governance processes or consider a few big issues a year?
- 9.8. Mike clarified that he had approached this as being an ethics committee for the College, to consider potentially contentious or controversial issues. It would not replace the national Home Office ethics committee but there could be some interaction between them. It could offer views on products owned and disseminated by the College. Board members suggested that the committee would have a stronger voice if it was more selective in the issues considered, rather than putting all products through it.
- 9.9. In summary, it was concluded that Board members were generally supportive of the concept but would like to discuss it further. In particular, they would want to see Terms of Reference developed to address how the committee would work, what types of issues would be referred to it and how it would interact with other committees.

### Action

Terms of reference to be developed and brought back to the Board for discussion and approval. These should, in particular, address how the committee would work, what types of issues would be referred to it and how it would interact with other committees. **Mike Cunningham/ Lucy Stewart-Winters**

## OFFICIAL

### Decision

The Board resolved to:

- (i) **Agree in principle** to the establishment of an Independent College Ethics Committee, subject to further development work being completed
- (ii) **Decline** to agree to the executive developing Terms of Reference for the committee, requesting instead that these be brought to the Board for consideration and approval.
- (iii) **Agree** that the committee would be independent of the College and not a committee of the Board

Lucy Stewart-Winters and Clare Minchington (on the phone) left the meeting.

### **10. Management Updates**

#### **(a) Finance, Performance and Risk Report (KH)**

- 10.1. Kate Husselbee highlighted three items.
- 10.2. Risk: A new risk had been added in relation to the Operation Uplift programme. A risk review had been held on 4 November and the outcome would be brought to the Audit and Risk Committee meeting on 4 December, and then to the next Board meeting.
- 10.3. Internal audit: There were some delays around the actions arising from the internal audit on decision making (governance), in particular the Terms of Reference for committees, so the timescales had been put back to take account of organisational change.
- 10.4. Finance – Projected forecast was for a £0.9m overspend. This was due to training delivery contracts having ended and not yet having a delivery pipeline. Work had ceased with Saudi Arabia. Contingency was being used and £0.5m of routine maintenance had been taken out of the estate programme. The budget was being managed with five months left to year end. Income projections were cautious, and expenditure should reduce. The budget was tight without allocating any money to the change programme and would need to be reviewed in January. The Establishment Board, which had been set up to manage recruitment, had taken some difficult decisions. The College was still committed to the things it had been doing and there was a need for prioritisation.
- 10.5. Bold decisions would be needed in relation to freeing up money for the change programme, for example a recruitment freeze. There was minimal flexibility with non-pay costs. Travel and subsistence could be reduced further but none of these would release the total required for the change programme.
- 10.6. It was asked if there was anything already allocated to the change programme that would not be required, and how much was actually needed, as the January meeting was a further two months down the line and decisions may be required. Mike advised that this was what the Executive had been tasked to do and if decisions were needed before the January meeting they could be considered out of committee.
- 10.7. It was suggested that it would be better to approach potential delivery partners with a budget asking what could be done within that, rather than inviting a quote independently of the budget available.
- 10.8. Kate observed that the funding award had been for one year and that in real terms there had been a 42% reduction in the College budget over recent years. It

## OFFICIAL

was unknown if this would continue to reduce. The College was putting the basics in place with regard to business development but there was a lot of potential. The College was not as yet set up to maximise income.

- 10.9. It was agreed that the financial situation still appeared manageable recognising that the executive were taking a number of steps but the position would be considered further in January.

### Decision

The Board resolved to:

- (i) **Note** the performance and internal audit updates
- (ii) **Note** the additional strategic risk

### **(b) Key performance questions: November Update (KH)**

- 10.10. Kate Husselbee advised that three KPQs had been prepared for the Board: connection, diverse workforce and decision making. As diversity had been discussed earlier in the meeting and decision making had been put back, it was agreed that the focus would be on connection.
- 10.11. Bernie O'Reilly indicated that international work, PEQF and Operation Uplift were all aspects of connection that represented significant risk for the College. A lot of feedback referred to a lack of connection and the College needed to be relevant to achieve connection. Connection did not always mean pleasing, PEQF being a good example of this, but the College did need to show it was listening. The website would be key in answering the KPQ, with account needing to be taken of both qualitative and quantitative data. Rachel was leading on the officer safety review and gaining great traction, the College was working with Cleveland and Northamptonshire and engaging with big issues.
- 10.12. Board members emphasised that KPQs were good at making people think and focusing response. In relation to measuring connection through the website, it was pointed out that the majority of officers engaged with the College on a daily basis through briefings without being aware of it. It was difficult to measure other than through the website and attendance at training events. Could it really be considered connection if people were unaware and what could the College do about increasing awareness? It was suggested that people seeking the College out was connection and delivering in the classroom was the College seeking to connect. It was also pointed out that much of the thinking about connection had evolved from a need to attract members, but that closure of the membership scheme could mean that the 'invisible hand' of the College would be a different way of connecting.
- 10.13. Rachel explained that the questions asked were those asked in the first College survey to establish a baseline.
- 10.14. Mike advised that the KPQs would continue to be reported on as a focus for the health of the organisation on a cycle. The aim would be to reach a point where the Board request a deeper dive on some of them.

### Decision

The Board resolved to:

- (i) **Note** the progress and update on the KPQs 2.1.1, 3.1.1 and 3.3.2

## **PART THREE – VERBAL UPDATES**

### **11. Chair's Update (MB)**

- 11.1. The Chair updated the Board on her meetings with PCCs, in particular meetings with the Deputy Mayor Manchester, the Derbyshire PCC, MOPAC and Katy Bourne as the new Chair of the APCC.
- 11.2. She had also spoken with Martin Hewitt at the All-Party Parliamentary Group on Policing and Security (APPG) session in the House of Lords.

### **12. Chief Executive's Report (MC)**

- 12.1. Mike Cunningham advised in relation to Operation Midland that HASC had set out the questions to be asked of the IOPC investigation before the election was announced. The issues reached beyond the Metropolitan Police Service to make it a national issue. The IOPC recommendations focused on learning and moving on and the College would be assisting with those. HMICFRS had commenced an inspection looking in particular at sexual offences and warrants. It was clarified that the notion of 'belief' of an alleged victim related to the Home Office counting rules for the purpose of opening a crime record and the College had recommended that a clarification be added to this effect, that it applied specifically to recording and should not influence the subsequent investigation.
- 12.2. The National Policing Board met for the second time before Parliament was dissolved. Measures to monitor national policing performance were discussed and it would be interesting to see how this crystallised if returned as it was difficult to envisage how performance could be assessed at the national rather than individual force level.
- 12.3. Work was being undertaken with the NPCC to cement a future close working relationship, key to which would be making the respective places of the College and NPCC clear to the service. Rachel was working on this and it would be brought to the Board once more was known.
- 12.4. A national leadership centre had been recently established. Mike had agreed to sit on the advisory board, and Jo would sit on the steering group. This would give the College a voice in leadership development.
- 12.5. The pre-election restrictions had commenced, on which guidance had been issued by the Cabinet Office.

### **13. Brexit Impact Group Update**

- 13.1. Rachel Tuffin indicated that the majority of risks were operational in nature, with the College having already addressed known gaps in guidance, learning and briefing materials. None were assessed as likely to have a significant impact on the College. A further update would be provided at the next Board meeting with any new developments.

#### Decision

The Board resolved to:

- (i) **Note** the update from the Brexit Impact Group

## **PART FOUR – CONCLUSION OF BUSINESS**

### **14. Any Other Business**

- 14.1. The Chair advised that it was Kate Husselbee's last Board meeting as she would be leaving the College in January. Kate had taken on a challenging brief with great success. The Chair expressed her personal gratitude for the support offered during the period when awaiting appointment of the CEO.
- 14.2. The Chair advised that it was also Helen Elderfield's last Board meeting. She thanked Helen for the notable improvements in governance and support for the Board which she and her team had achieved.
- 14.3. No additional matters were raised for discussion.

### **15. Review of the meeting**

- 15.1. The Chair invited Kate Husselbee to offer her views on the meeting.
- 15.2. Kate commented that the strategy discussion session on the international work had been very helpful and the dynamic of working in groups had been a positive one. The session should be used successfully at future Board meetings on other topics.
- 15.3. Kate observed that good discussions had been had in the main meeting, with constructive challenge from Board members.
- 15.4. Clare Minchington, having joined the meeting by phone, had earlier commented that the audio quality had been good and she had been able to participate fully in both the strategy discussion and the formal meeting.

### **16. Close of the meeting**

- 16.1. There being no further business the meeting was closed at 15:32.

**Date of next meeting:** 29<sup>th</sup> January 2020

**Name of Chair:** Millie Banerjee